

## New-York Daily Tribune

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1863.

THE TRIBUNE ALMANAC for 1863 is at length ready for the general public. It was put to press on the 1st, but the intermediate time has been required for printing 40,000 copies to supply orders already received, and which were entitled to a preference. It is so condensed as to give more matter for 15 cents than is usually sold for a dollar. Among its contents, we will instance the following:

The most important Acts (condensed) of the present Congress at its late session, including the Homestead, Confession, Pacific Railroad, Agricultural College, &c., with laws to punish French in contracts and venality in Members of Congress; also those prohibiting Slavery and Polygamy in the Territories, abolishing Slavery in the Federal District, forbidding soldiers to catch fugitive slaves, &c., &c.

The Internal Revenue or Tax-bill, condensed.

The present Tariff ditto.

A Chronicle of the principal Events of the War during 1862.

The Election Returns for 1862 from all the States and Territories, with the Voluntary Vote by itself.

Statistics from the U. S. Census of 1860.

U. S. Government—Executive, Judiciary, Embassadors, &c. Members of the 36th Congress, with those newly elected to the 37th.

The Rebel Government in December, 1862.

Orders received before the 1st inst. are filled. Subsequent orders will be filled as fast as funds permit. Subscribers for the Almanac at the Office, or by mail, for cash. Copies for sale at the Office, or by mail, for cash. Price 15 cents, 11 copies for \$1.10, 100 copies, \$9. postage paid. By Express, \$3.00 per 100. Cash orders solicited. We can supply book numbers of the Tribune Almanac for years 1850, 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861 and 1862. Price 15 cents each, post-paid.

Address THE TRIBUNE, New-York.

On and after this date, THE TRIBUNE will not receive either corporate or individual subscriptions. Government postal currency only will be received for fractional parts of a dollar.

## NEWS OF THE DAY.

## THE WAR.

—News from Yazoo River to the 3d inst. confirms the account of Gen. McClelland's abandonment of one attack on Vicksburg. The enemy had 60,000 men, and 160 guns in batteries, beside field artillery. Our fleet had decided upon attacking some other place.

—Gen. Magruder, in his official report to the Rebel War Department of the affair at Galveston, says that four or five Union gunboats escaped ignominiously under a flag of truce.

—Our correspondent with Gen. Sumner's division records the disappearance of a Rebel brigade on Sunday. It is presumed that they have been sent off to the South.

—An important bill for coast and lake fortifications is to be reported to the House to-day. Some of its provisions are noted in our telegraph columns.

## GENERAL NEWS.

—In the United States Senate yesterday a bill was offered and referred to aid West Virginia in a speedy and final abolition of Slavery. The bill for a further issue of bonds and notes was adopted. (This is Mr. Chase's great financial measure). The bill for the more prompt payment of soldiers was postponed, it being stated that its chief provisions were embodied in the financial bill just adopted. After discussion of the bill to reorganize the Court of Claims, the bill for the discharge of State prisoners was taken up, and Mr. Wilkinson made a speech. No vote was taken. The bill to raise volunteers for the defense of Kentucky was adopted—23 to 13.

In the House, an attempt was made to take up the bill reducing the duty on printing paper but it was defeated. The House called for a statement of the expenses incurred for the support of slaves in dialysis. A resolution fully indorsing and ratifying the President's Proclamation was referred to the Judiciary Committee, an attempt to vote it down failing—Yeas, 40; Nays, 85. Inquiry was proposed into the expediency of granting bounty lands to soldiers. The President was asked to send in his instructions to Military Governors concerning elections of Members of Congress. Leave was asked to bring in a bill to establish a Bureau of Emancipation. A Committee was voted to report on the expediency of building a military and post road from New-York to Washington. The Naval Committee were asked to inquire into the expediency of laying a telegraph wire from Fort Monroe to New Orleans. It was voted that no money ought to be given to civil creditors until the soldiers in service are fully paid. A bill was proposed to pay \$5 per month with rations—one-half to go to their families, or be retained where they have none. Its consideration was postponed to the 21st inst. An effort was made, unsuccessfully, to pass slave-catching resolutions to apply to Maryland. This brought out a resolution inquiring into the expediency of giving aid to Maryland to abolish Slavery. In Committee of the Whole, the bill to provide means for the support of the Government was discussed, Mr. Spaulding making an elaborate speech.

—The New-York Assembly made no progress yesterday in organization. After the 53d ballot for Speaker, which stood 41 to 41, they adjourned until to-day.

—The mails of the Africa reached this city yesterday morning. Her news has been anticipated by the Jara. The foreign files, brought by her, are to Dec. 27, two days later than those previously received. The London Times has another communication from its "special" correspondent in Virginia, which sketches life in the Rebel army. Professor Laboulaye of Paris, the eloquent champion of the Union cause in France, has written another powerful article on the American Question which has made considerable sensation in France and England. He undertakes to prove that a separation would inevitably lead to perpetual war.

—The excitement at Harrisburg, Pa., in consequence of threats of violence in case of the election of a Union Senator in place of the Hon. David Wilnot, was so great yesterday that Mr. Lowry, a Union State Senator, offered a resolution that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday. The resolution was laid over until this morning. Should it pass, there will be no election; as the State law requires the balloting to be held this day.

—Wisconsin papers say that Walter D. McIndoe, Republican, has been elected to the present Congress, to fill the seat vacated by the death of Luther Hanchett of the 11d District, and also as member from the 11th District in the next Congress, to which Mr. Hanchett was elected last November. The few returns before us indicate a tight vote.

—Among the schemes broached at the first meeting (yesterday) of the new Board of Aldermen of this city, are more clerks at Washington Market, the legalization of the recently appointed Commissioners of Deeds, the completion of the Battery enlargement, and the extension of the Belgian pavement over the whole city.

—The New-Jersey Legislature is to meet at Trenton to-day, and as both Houses are largely Democratic, an organization will doubtless be effected promptly. Gov. Parker will not be inaugurated until the 20th.

—The Standing Committee of the Board of Alder-

men were appointed yesterday. Ald. Boole is lucky enough to have place in nine of the most important of them. This ought to satisfy even his untiring industry.

—The Aldermanic war upon the Central Park Commissioners is temporarily suspended, and the Finance Committee report in favor of supplying them with money to the extent of \$50,000.

—The City Inspector's annual report was sent to the Aldermen yesterday. The deaths in this city in 1862 were 21,345. Mr. Delevan once more exposes the outrageous street cleaning contract.

—The speculative excitement in the Stock market took a fresh start yesterday morning, and the advance in some descriptions of securities exceeded anything which has been seen since the movement commenced. The greatest rise was in Pacific Mail, which sold as high as 137, against 148 on Saturday. Governments were depressed 1 to 1 1/2 per cent. in consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of the interview on Saturday night between Mr. Chase and the bankers. After the Board, the market was weaker, under large sales to railroad buyers, but at the Second Board the market recovered its buoyancy, and, under considerable excitement, higher prices in some cases were given than at the Morning Board. The market for Foreign Exchange has been very much excited. Merchants' bills have been sold at 154 1/2 100, and Bankers' at 152 1/2 100. France are 3.00. Freight are rather firmer, with a moderate business doing.

As we surmised, the country has been unnecessarily excited into apprehensions for the safety of Springfield, Mo. The proportions given to the Rebel attack upon that devoted town by the first telegraphic reports seem to have been unwarrantably large. Such as it was, the garrison repulsed it in a manner that will probably prevent a repetition of the enterprise on the part of the Rebels.

## CONCENTRATION OF EFFORT.

Gen. Hunter returns forthwith to the command of the Southern Department, and there is a very general expectation that his arrival at Port Royal will be the signal for renewed activity thereabout. This must depend, however, on another matter, with regard to which we are not and would not be informed—that of reinforcements. Twenty thousand men may spend a year on the Sea Islands very safely, so far as Rebels are regarded, but rather uselessly so far as the suppression of the slaveholders' revolt is concerned. Such a force is too large for merely holding the Sea Islands and too small for any considerable service beyond that.

We do not know whether it will be best to withdraw half the force we now have in South Carolina or to treble it and go ahead; but we ought clearly to do one thing or the other. We trust, therefore, that the Rebel reports of a heavy concentration of Union soldiers in North Carolina with a view to an immediate resumption of the offensive are well founded, and that this force will either be dispatched in good part to re-enforce Gen. Hunter or Gen. Hunter ordered to re-enforce it. If the Republic intends to strike telling blows, it must double its fist.

## THE RIGHT TO FREE AND ARM SLAVES IN CIVIL WAR.

We presume no one will contend that, in case of the formidable invasion of any slaveholding country by a foreign power, the invaded people would not have a perfect right to free and arm their slaves to aid them in resisting and repelling the invaders. Most certainly, we have never yet seen it even suggested that this would violate the canons of humane and civilized warfare. The ranks of the Russian armies have for centuries been in good part filled by serfs, who by becoming soldiers earned their freedom. Was this ever complained of by any nation or government whose armies were required to meet these emancipated bondmen in the shock of battle? If it has, we never heard of it. And that the great armies of the Christian Crusaders were habitually and largely recruited from among the serfs who then tilled the fields of Western Europe, and who, by fighting for the recovery of the Holy Sepulcher from the clutch of the Infidel, achieved their freedom and that of their posterity, will not, we presume, be disputed. The Paynim chivalry were all slaveholders; but we cannot remember any complaint on their part that they were compelled to encounter in battle the serfs of their knightly foes.

If Jefferson Davis had seen fit, one year ago, to proclaim that every slave would volunteer to fight for his Confederacy should, at the close of the war, be enfranchised, we presume no one doubts that he would have thereby secured legions of sable warriors. Does any one believe or pretend that we should thereupon have threatened those soldiers and their White officers with the ignominious death of felons whenever taken prisoners of war? Where is the canon of international law, where the section in the code of war, that would have authorized us thus to hang men for what Jefferson would term listening to the call of their imperiled country? There is none.

The clamor against the liberation of the slaves of the Confederates as a war measure implies a cool assumption that the masters are not Rebels. If they are, the outcry in their behalf is simply absurd. Slaves are abstractly and generically prisoners of war; and to say that a belligerent may not set free the captives of his foe is to talk wildly enough; while to maintain that a rightful sovereign, whose authority is defied, whose rule is resisted by a subject, may not decree the freedom of that subject's bondmen, whom he is using in aid of his rebellion, is to say that the sovereign's hands and feet are tied, and his right to vindicate his authority a delusion. Jefferson Davis exercises the right to confiscate the slaves whether of loyal or disloyal masters by allowing his partisans to shoot those who are found guarding our trains or cooking and serving in our camps. True, he kills, while we free them; but the assumption of power is the same, and the master loses his property in either case; dead negroes being of no more account, pecuniarily, than though they had run from Carolina to Canada.

Only let it be settled that our Government has equal rights as a belligerent with that of the Rebels—that they may not justifiably treat a citizen of the United States residing in Tennessee any worse than we may treat a citizen of the Confederate States residing in that locality, and all is clear. Jeff.'s organs tell us that he will hang negroes who shall be caught fighting on the side of the Union as "not in

war, but in sedition." But suppose we were to treat our Confederate captives as "not in war, but in sedition"—that is, suppose we were to try, sentence, and execute them as traitors—the civilized world would ring with Confederate denunciations of our inhuman severity. Mr. Jefferson Davis decides that his Tennesseans, &c., are at war with the United States, but that ours are guilty of sedition and treason in resisting his power. If you assent to this, you may plausibly oppose the Proclamation of Freedom; but then you should scout all pretense that our Government is engaged in putting down a rebellion, and hold that the Union and the Confederacy are at war for the settlement of disputed boundaries, and that the latter has a right to the services of every citizen of any of the so-called Confederate States. This reminds us of the U. S. Military officer who, asking one of our convalescent soldiers to what regiment he belonged, and being answered, "The Seventh [loyal] Virginia," coolly rejoined, "Then you ought to be fighting on the other side." Does any one doubt that that officer is hostile to the policy of Emancipation?

## TOO FAST AND TOO SLOW.

The National Intelligencer tries hard to be mischievous, and succeeds in being malignant, with regard to recent military occurrences in Virginia. Here is a specimen: "Meanwhile it is gratifying to observe that the 'On to Richmond' cry has entirely ceased to disturb the equanimity or embarrass the orderly processes of the Administration. That cuckoo cry came to an end as soon as Gen. McClelland had been displaced for his 'immobility.' While he was at the head of the Army of the Potomac, it never moved fast enough to please either the Government or a certain class of the people. After he had been removed, it appears that Gen. Burnside (we quote his own words) was 'troubled by the President, the Secretary of War and the General-in-Chief not to be in haste,' and the military editors who made the 'delay' of McClelland after the battle of Antietam a source of so much complaint are now perfectly satisfied with the progress which Burnside has made and is making in moving from Warrenton 'On to Richmond' via Fredericksburg. We cite the case not by way of reflection on Gen. Burnside but by way of comment on the anxious which controls the 'art of military criticism' in this enlightened country."

The answer to this is very simple. Gen. McClelland, after Antietam, was at the head of a more numerous, better equipped, and every way better provided army than was opposed to him—an army that was in high spirits over the result of the conflicts at Sharpsburg and Antietam. He was very near his base of supplies, while the Rebels were very far from theirs, and had great difficulties of transportation to contend with. He was at once nearer to Washington and nearer to Richmond than Lee was. The season was favorable, the roads and streams in the best condition. He was expected, desired, ordered, to preserve these advantages, by keeping his army between Lee and the two capitals, and compelling the Rebels to fight on ground proffering at least equal advantages to our troops. He deliberately disobeyed these orders, and allowed Lee to outgeneral and move around him, so as to intercept his army once more between ours and Richmond, and thus compel us to fight him on ground of his own choice or be content with merely covering Washington. It was this, and not any clamor for an immediate move on Richmond, that doubtless caused his removal and justified the very general satisfaction wherewith that change was received.

## COLORADO.

Five years ago, the White settlers within the limits of this Territory may have numbered three or four hundred, mainly trappers; but there was probably not a framed house, nor ought that began to be a village, within its limits, save possibly in some New-Mexican hamlet near its southern extremity. Less than four years ago Denver, its only miners' settlement, was a log village of perhaps a hundred huts, its principal hotel having a canvas roof, log sides, and no floor but the naked earth. There may have been a thousand Whites living—or, rather, strolling—within what is now Colorado on the 1st of January, 1859. It was organized as a Territory in 1860. In 1862, its popular vote on delegate to Congress was 5,721, or nearly twice that of Nebraska, which was organized in 1854.

Colorado is said to have produced Gold to the value of Millions of Dollars during the past year; but at what cost doth not appear. Individuals probably have done well; but while nearly everything consumed by the miners must be wagoned six hundred miles from the Missouri, at a cost of \$100 to \$150 per ton, it is not probable that the great mass of diggers and washers have more than paid their expenses. Gold that is worth \$18 per ounce, and can be produced for \$15 after the Pacific Railroad shall have reached the Rocky Mountains, must now cost \$25 or \$30, resulting in loss to the producer. Yet the Colorado journals estimate the product of 1863 at \$12,000,000, or double that of 1862.

Certain heavy capitalists of the Old World, familiar with mining and the conditions under which it may be prosecuted with profit, are soon to send out experienced and capable engineers to scrutinize certain mining locations which Mr. W. Cornell Jewett offered to their acceptance during his recent visit to Europe. These engineers will come impressed with the truth that "All is not gold that glitters," and that gold, like everything else, may cost more than it is worth. If their report should be favorable, it will doubtless lead to a large application, in due time, of foreign capital and energy to the development of the resources of the new Territory.

## "COMPROMISE."

The Trenton True American holds that the Republicans ought to have compromised in 1861 on the Crittenden platform. But how was that a compromise? Our cardinal principle was hostility to the Extension of Slavery. The South never expected nor seriously claimed that all the Territories should be assigned to Slavery. After the apostasy of the Slave States from Jefferson's original ground where we now stand, they demanded a division of the Territories between Free and Slave Labor. They carried this in the case of the Missouri controversy, by the help of a very few Members from the Free States, who generally lost their seats by it. They offered to extend it in 1847 and '8

on the Oregon bill, but were voted down in the House in each case—the Northern Democrats, almost to a man, voting with all the Northern Whigs in the negative. Mr. Crittenden actually offered us less than the North had repeatedly and all but unanimously rejected—not one party, but both. How, then, could our assent to this in 1861 have been a compromise? It would have been a naked, absolute, cowardly apostasy and surrender, as *The American* would have set forth forty times over. Let Democratic treason, avowed and clandestine, do its worst, it can never make us regret that we did not sell our souls even for peace.

## A NATIONAL CONVENTION.

We stated, some days since, that President Lincoln, Gov. Morgan, and other Republicans, including ourselves, were prepared, in the early months of 1861, to favor the call of a National Convention, had the disaffected desired that resort for the settlement of our domestic troubles. To this, the Albany organ of Seymourism responds thus courteously:

"We need not say that the above is from THE N. Y. TRIBUNE. We have said it before. The call of a Convention must be made (Art. V, Const. U. S.) on the application of two-thirds of the several States. In 1861, nearly every Northern State was in the hands of the Republicans; and if they had wished to call a Convention to amend the Constitution, there were fifteen Legislatures under their control. In which the movement might have been initiated, it would have been easy to have carried several more."

"This device is an afterthought of THE TRIBUNE, which is looking about for excuses from its guilty responsibility in this matter."

—Of course, we Republicans had no *intention* to call a Convention, unless that was accepted beforehand by the malcontents as a satisfactory alternative for the Rebellion they were then fermenting. We were content with "the Union as it was and the Constitution as it is." We wanted no Convention for our own sakes, and had no idea of forcing one upon others. But if the Democrats had then chosen to have a Convention, the Republicans generally would have united cordially and promptly in calling one. But no—the suggestion elicited no response. The Southern Democrats were intent on Disunion; the Northern on bullying the Republicans into a shameful betrayal of their leading principle; and neither of them wanted a Convention. Of course, it would have been useless to hold one unless there should be substantial unanimity in calling it and a general agreement to abide its result. But if any one doubts that our former statement was literally true, he can easily be satisfied. And if those who were allowed no choice but between a repudiation of their solemn convictions of Right and Duty and a bloody Civil War have any "guilty responsibility" in the premises, we covet the largest possible share of it.

## THE CHARGE OF THE CITY JUDGE.

It is the fashion, with a certain class of Democrats, just now, to seize upon every pretext, however frivolous, for assailing the Administration. With this class the City Judge, McCune, has no sympathy nor affiliation. His colleague, the Democratic Recorder, may harangue the Grand Jury in denunciation of the Government, and his associate, the newly-dedicated Democratic District-Attorney, with all the zeal of a neophyte, may lend swift counsel in the work of disorganization; but, when his turn comes, Judge McCune does not hesitate to condemn their conduct from the bench. His charge to the Grand Jury yesterday, which we print elsewhere, presents a strong contrast to that of the Recorder. Instead of denouncing the Government, and counseling the Grand Jury to indict this or that member of the Cabinet, he advises them to allow no unjust feelings, no personal motives or animosities, no private interests, political or otherwise, to enter into their considerations; but to close their doors sacredly against every undue influence, no matter whence it might emanate. It is not to be denied that in some instances the Government has dealt harshly with individuals, by arresting and imprisoning them without trial; but it is not to be supposed that these extra-judicial proceedings were dictated by any other than the purest motives, or that they were designed to serve any other purpose than the good of the country.

The late attempts by the Democratic press, the Recorder, and the District-Attorney, to inflame the public mind in regard to "arbitrary arrests," have signally failed. Under the guise of redressing the wrongs of some of the "martyrs of the War Department," these "opponents of the Lincoln Government" took up the case of two persons who were shown to have been deeply implicated in swindling the Government, in the subsistence of soldiers, to a very large amount. The testimony obtained by the War Commission, now sitting in this city, demonstrated the true character of these "injured innocents;" and, in spite of the efforts of a subsidized press, and a partisan Recorder and District-Attorney, two successive Grand Juries expelled the unclean creatures from their presence. Now, upon this double defeat, comes the judicial condemnation of the City Judge. He deserves, and will receive, the commendation of all good citizens for his patriotism and independence.

## THE SITUATION IN MIDDLE TENNESSEE.

The latest advices from Middle Tennessee indicate that another struggle between the armies of Gens. Rosecrans and Bragg will be necessary to clear that part of the country of the Rebel forces. If the Rebel General proposes to make good his assurances, and ventures upon another trial of arms before surrendering the State to our troops, at his present position in the vicinity of Tullahoma, another battle is likely to take place within two days' march of the fighting-ground before Murfreesboro. Gen. Rosecrans seems to appreciate the necessity of the destruction of the hostile armies as a vital condition of the suppression of the Rebellion, better than any other of our commanders, and hence we are inclined to think that should the enemy again accept battle, the nearer it is to his base of operations the more welcome it will be to him. It is true the section held by the enemy abounds with positions most advantageous for warfare. But, as General Rosecrans has been reinforced by at least 20,000 men, relieved from guard-duty along the Louisville and

Nashville Railroad, by the opening of a new and secure line of communication via the Cumberland River, and resupplied with artillery, now more than sufficient to make up for the losses sustained, we have no fears as to the result of the renewal of the strife.

## THE RIGHT OF SOLDIERS TO VOTE.

There are few questions, not immediately connected with the prosecution of the war, which have excited more general interest than the controversy as to the right of soldiers, absent at the seat of war, to vote in their respective States. In Pennsylvania, Iowa, Missouri, Minnesota, Kansas, Wisconsin, and Connecticut, laws have been passed to give them this right. The measure is popular, and commends itself to every man's sense of justice. None but the meanest of politicians would desire to disqualify a citizen from voting, because of his absence in the field, in defense of his country.

The vital question is as to the constitutionality of such laws, and it by no means follows that, such a law being possible in Iowa, it is therefore possible in New-York. The question at issue must be decided under the Constitution of each State, in accordance with the established principles of judicial interpretation. In Missouri, there is no room for controversy. The soldiers of that State have been authorized to vote by an ordinance of its Convention, which is clothed with supreme power, and whose acts are constitutions of themselves. In Pennsylvania, the Court of last resort, some time ago, declared the law of that State permitting absent soldiers to vote to be unconstitutional, and no votes were taken under it this year. In Minnesota and Kansas, no important results have been affected by such votes. In the other States, the question is undergoing local investigation.

In Connecticut, a law of this kind was recently passed, and, by request of the Legislature, the highest Court of that State assembled and took the subject into deliberate consideration. The Constitution of Connecticut directs that the votes of electors shall be received in town meetings, each elector to vote in his own town. In consequence of this provision, the Court unanimously held the law to be unconstitutional. This decision we believe to have been honestly rendered by an impartial Court, and though it will have a serious effect upon the political aspect of the State next Spring, and may possibly result in throwing it into the hands of the Secession party for a year, we would not cast a word of censure upon Judges who have, we are sure, only performed a painful duty.

In Iowa, we are satisfied that the Courts will reach a different conclusion. The only provision of the Constitution of that State upon the subject is as follows:

"Every white male citizen, &c., of the age of 21, who shall have been a resident of this State six months next preceding the election, and of the county in which he claims his vote six days, shall be entitled to vote." &c., &c.

Inasmuch as no one loses a residence by temporary absence from the State in the service of the United States, it seems clear that this clause does not debar the Legislature from authorizing soldiers to vote.

In the Constitution of New-York, the language used on this subject is somewhat different. It is provided that a citizen who has been an inhabitant of the State one year, "and for the last four months a resident of the county where he may offer his vote, shall be entitled to vote at such election, in the election district of which he shall at the time be a resident, and not elsewhere." (Const. of 1846, art. 2, sec. 1.) But it is further expressly declared (sec. 3) that no person shall be deemed to have lost a residence by reason of his absence in the service of the United States. Under this provision, it may well be doubted whether a person employed in the United States service is not to be deemed constructively present in his district for all purposes connected with elections. If the affirmative view should be taken, it would seem that the Legislature might receive the vote of a soldier as constructively present in his own election district. Especially would this seem feasible if the law should provide for the addition of the soldiers' votes to that of each election district separately, instead of counting their votes in mass.

It appears to us to be the duty of the new Legislature to test this question, and to absolve themselves from all responsibility for denying to the brave men who have gone to the war the privilege of choosing their rulers.

## HISTORICAL SCARECROWS.

The cheapest and, at the same time, the readiest of all subterfuges, when logic is lacking, is the Historical Bugaboo. Its employment is quite independent of sense or of scholarship. A single event, no matter how ancient, may be turned into a fresh fright upon twenty widely different occasions, and be pertinaciously and often effectively obtruded, without the least regard to the indisputable fact that the world is considerably older than it was upon the day of its creation. The failure of past republics is made proof prophetic of the instability of all popular governments. Commonwealths must go to ruin eighteen centuries after Christ because commonwealths went to ruin two centuries before Christ. History is only written to prove that "Naught is everything, and everything is naught."

Is it proposed, in countries principally Protestant, to emancipate the Catholics? Remember St. Bartholomew! Is it argued that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed? Think of the red rivers of the French Revolution! Do we ask for justice to the American Slave? Men with hearts as hard in their bigotry as that of St. Dominic himself parade the butcheries of St. Domingo! The fact of the massacres is sufficient. What caused them—who was in the right, and who was in fault—whether the Blacks did anything to be praised instead of blamed—these are minor considerations, unworthy of the attention of men who know absolutely nothing of that sad history, and who could not, for their lives, upon a cross-examination, tell us whether Toussaint was a black man or a white one, what he did while living, or where, or under what circumstances, he died. It is enough to scream "St. Domingo!" and every Abolitionist is considered to be effectually graveled. It is in this idiotic way that History is abused. *The Express* doesn't know much, but it can whine—"St. Domingo!" *The Herald* never makes a pretense of argument, but it can bawl—"St. Domingo!" Women can whimper it—platform prophets can howl it—cross and crested conservatives can adduce it victoriously—and parsons, vibrating between duty and dollars, finding that a defense of Slavery upon the Judaic basis involves abstinence from sausages, can abandon Palestine for the West Indies without interfering with their breakfasts. It is of little use to ask these people to hear the whole story. Why should they listen, if, by being tolerably well informed, they are to be diddled out of a good, chronic cry? Why tell them that, after the decree of the French Convention in 1794 had confirmed the emancipation of the colony, the most respectable authorities declare that the freedmen were peaceable and industrious, working upon their old plantations and for their old masters? That, of course, is not a fact of any importance. Why tell these historical gentlemen, who know everything, that nine-tenths of the atrocities committed by the Blacks were incited by Whites and Mulattoes? That is of no consequence. Why show that under Toussaint the colony flourished, the Whites living happily upon their plantations, the estates well and cheerfully cultivated by the blacks, until the expedition of Le Clerc, sent forward by that wily Italian, to whom the very name of Liberty was detestable, arrived for the single purpose of restoring Slavery? What followed—the tearing of the Negroes by bloodhounds—the wholesale massacre of the Blacks—the infinite cruelties inflicted by the planters—is not so well known as the final expulsion of the French and the horrors by which it was attended. That the Blacks took an ample revenge is not denied. That they were always humane is not asserted. But it is, nevertheless, equally true that if ever cruelties were provoked, it was when the needless and unjustifiable interference of Bonaparte aroused passions which in men of a different complexion would have been considered worthy only of the warmest praise.

Such is the case of St. Domingo. Admitting all that the advocates of Human Bondage say of it, it proves nothing against Emancipation and everything against Re-enslavement. To any rash deductions from its darker features, we are at liberty to oppose all the other experiences of modern times. Not to enter into minor details, we fearlessly appeal to the great experiment in the British West Indies. We are aware of the commercial objections which have been made to that measure—the complaint of meager crops and of reduced incomes—the ruin which it is asserted has overtaken the landed proprietors. But we are not now considering a question of pounds sterling or of the diminished value of sugar estates. We are investigating the chances of social safety and order under the new relations which Emancipation establishes. According to the doctrine of the Negrophobist, the West India Blacks should have cut every Englishman's throat—and the worst that Thomas Carlyle, in his diabolical hatred of the African, can say, is, that while he can get pumpkins for nothing, the Freedman will not dig potatoes! This the sternest moralist will admit is something less than the murders, rapes and arsons which should have followed that memorable First of August, and which we are invited to believe will follow our own memorable First of January.

For ourselves, if we are to be guided in our present duties by the precedents of the past, we prefer to select our own examples and to draw our own conclusions. If the latest English newspapers come to us freighted with sarcastic sneers at the Emancipation of the American Slave, we can read them with equanimity when we remember that Mr. Dundas, in 1792, proposed in Parliament the Emancipation of the British Blacks—that Mr. Burke prepared a bill for the same great purpose—that Mr. Pitt avowed that the Abolition of Slavery—that Sir Samuel Romilly, in pronouncing the doom of a barbarous commerce, anticipated the time when "the West Indies should no more be cultivated, as now, by wretched slaves, but by happy and contented laborers"—that the careless but kind-hearted Sheridan declared that the Abolition of the slave-trade was "the proper preamble to the entire abolition of Slavery"—that Lord Grenville, then Prime Minister, moved Emancipation in the House of Lords—and, finally, that old Dr. Johnson used to drink, as a favorite toast: "A speedy insurrection of the slaves of Jamaica, and success to them!" These were the views of enlightened English statesmen and thinkers nearly a century ago. These opinions, familiar as they are to our own educated classes, have done much to create and strengthen that hostility to Slavery which the great organ of the British shop-keepers now stigmatizes as fanaticism and folly. Let it rave! Let its passion for pounds sterling get the better of its moral principles! The world moves; and a century hence men will read its leading articles as they now read the Tory diatribes of Sir Roger L'Estrange.

## A HINDOO CONTRIBUTION TO SOLDIERS' FAMILIES.

—KARNATAKA MADHAVADA, a Hindoo citizen of Bombay, a well-known student of American history and literature, has sent \$1,000 to Richard H. Dana, jr., of Boston, to be given for the relief of suffering soldiers' families. Mr. Dana divided the amount between two families—one that of a teacher who had lost two sons by the war, and had six daughters to provide for; the other family being the widow and young children of a Major of artillery, otherwise without resources. One family was American and Protestant, the other Irish and Roman Catholic. Mr. Dana, in a published letter, conveys to this noble-hearted foreigner assurances of the gratitude of the recipients of his gift, and of the respect and good will that have been called forth toward him by his generosity.

## KINGS COUNTY REPUBLICAN GENERAL COM.

METTING.—The first meeting of this organization for 1863 will be held at the Committee Rooms, this evening, at 7 o'clock. See advertisement in special notice column.